

armaments to-day was of negative character. This was a denial by the American delegates of the sensational report sent out late last night that the Tokio Government had formally instructed its delegates to fight to the end for the substitution of a plan that would increase its naval strength from 10-5-3 to 10-10-7 and insure the retention of the dreadnought Mutsu, which is really the chief point of the issue.

Japanese Plan Not Ultimatum.
The American delegation caused it to be known that since the Japanese naval experts had passed up their ambitious formula to the full conference committee on naval armaments there had been no move in the matter. This was on November 22, on which date the Japanese plan was brought forward. Further, it was made known by statement that Baron Kato, on behalf of the Japanese delegation, had formally presented to Mr. Hughes and Mr. Balfour the opinion of the experts of his country as an ultimatum.

It is not probable that any addition to the accepted history of the naval negotiations will be made until the Japanese delegation indicates its readiness to discuss it in public conference session and join with the United States and Great Britain in accomplishing the major undertaking of the conference.

The most important event of a naval character to-day was the statement made by the naval authorities of at least two of the most important sea powers that the suggestion for a ten year naval holiday would probably be abandoned. For several days naval experts have pointed out to heads of this and other Governments the impracticability of the holiday feature.

Admirals made by some of the delegates tend to confirm the impression in naval circles that the ten year holiday plan will be eliminated. The chief reason given in support of the contention of the naval executives of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and they appear to be close together in the matter, is that legitimate demands would be impossible and that the warship construction facilities of all countries would fall to ruin.

Holiday Would Benefit Britain.
Credit for developing this objection to the holiday plan is given to the British and American experts, who pointed out the holiday idea would result in one or two countries securing a decided advantage over other nations. It is of incidental interest that the chief beneficiary in this respect would be Great Britain. Secretary Hughes and his associates have not taken up the matter yet, though they are expected to consult with the naval experts of the country about it in a few days.

British and American discovery naturally caused somewhat of a sensation among the officials of several Governments, although it is not expected to exercise any decided influence over the really vital features of the Hughes plan. The naval holiday suggestion really is not regarded as being directly related to limitations of sea armaments for the reason that in no event would any country be permitted to exceed the maximum allowance stipulated in the Hughes formula.

Critics of the tactics employed by Japan in the naval controversy have naturally tried to connect them with ambitions in Asiatic and Pacific issues. It is quite possible that the Japanese mind has constructed a direct link between the two phases of the conference, although the fact has not been looked to American officials. The argument advanced by the Japanese is that the knowledge of the world power already rendered by the Japanese delegates in clearing up Asiatic perplexities is that they are holding back the naval armaments agreement for trading purposes.

There is no question that Japan attaches paramount importance to the plans of the American Government for fortifying its Pacific island possessions, especially Guam, which little atom is destined to play a spectacular part in conference proceedings later. The Japanese made little attempt to conceal their anxiety over what they described to "be the new American foreign policy" when I was in Japan two months ago.

Japanese Cite Monroe Doctrine.
The intentions of the United States were made the subject of daily discussion by the newspapers and the leaders of rival political parties. The consensus of journalists and politicians was that the fortification of Guam or the Philippines would closely approach encroachment in that part of the world in which Japan claims privileges not unlike those enjoyed by all countries in North and South America under the Monroe Doctrine.

The announcement that the United States intended thoroughly to fortify Guam and the Philippines unmistakably caused consternation among the Japanese. The fact is it constituted a greater insult to Japanese interests than other features scheduled for consideration at the conference. Yet up to date no mention has been made of Guam or the Philippines. It may be that in withholding acceptance of the Hughes plan, the Japanese delegates have given to Guam an important part in their calculations. If that is the fact the American delegates do not know of it. Until they do, they will not discuss the matter one way or the other.

It was made quite clear to-day that Japan does not intend to cause complications over the Shantung controversy, which assumed major proportions at the peace conference at Paris. A good beginning toward a satisfactory solution of the Kiau-Chow problem was made to-day, which may eliminate it from the scope of the conference agenda.

Prince Tokugawa and Minister Sze, representing Japan and the Peking Government, indicated in a series of "conversations" in an effort to reach an agreement over the disputed Chinese territory now held by Japan. Mr. Hughes, representing the United States, and Mr. Balfour, the spokesman for Great Britain, were present in response to an invitation from the Japanese and Chinese representatives and paved the way for an understanding through direct negotiations instead of making it a subject for possible discord in the conference.

The American and British officials proffered their good offices in trying to promote an agreement as to the terms under which Japan will keep her pledge to restore Kiau-Chow to China. After urging the Japanese and Chinese envoys to resume the direct negotiations broken off by China, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Balfour withdrew, leaving be-

HIDDEN MOTIVE SEEN IN KATO'S NAVY PLEA

London 'Times' Editor Asks Why Japan Is Anxious to Exceed Hughes Ratio.

MAY MENACE CHINA

Tokio's Course Alienating British Nations From Their Present Ally.

PERSPECTIVE DISTORTED

Far Sighted Moderation Essential to Success of Mikado's Representatives.

By WICKHAM STEED.
Editor of the London Times.
(Copyright, 1921, by United News.)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 1.—The time has come to speak with the utmost frankness. The Japanese delegation insists upon the allotment to Japan of 70 per cent. of the American or British capital ship strength. In the unanimous opinion of the American and British naval authorities this demand is not warranted. It is justified neither by the present nor the prospective strength of the Japanese navy. Therefore Japanese insistence raises the question of the ulterior political intentions of Japan.

Does Japan desire to increase her relative naval strength for the purpose of perpetuating and completing the policy of disintegration and encroachment upon China, which, as Japanese opponents of that policy truthfully aver, she has deliberately followed during the last decade?

Oversteps Anglo-Japan Treaty.
Profiting by the concentration of British attention upon European affairs and by British absorption in the war, she has secured the support and spirit of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, just as she has used her position as successor to Germany in Shantung to overstep the legitimate implications of that position. If now she demands an undue ratio of naval strength and attempts to employ the complexities of the Shantung question as a lever to extract American and British assent to a harder bargain than any they can conscientiously agree to, she inevitably casts a doubt upon her own sincerity and raises in an acute form a fundamental issue.

One of the best questions of the conference is the value of Japanese professions of goodwill toward China. Upon this hinges the further question whether the militarist, pan-Asiatic policy attributed to Japan is necessary to do something about Russia, and this brings up the question of de jure recognition of Russia. If Russia is not recognized the Powers may not invite her to the conference. If Russia is invited will the other Powers guarantee Poland against Russia and France against Germany? Unless the Powers calling the conference are prepared to give guarantees France may ask that a method of getting over this difficulty be the first thing to be considered.

The situation as it applies to Italy was outlined by the spokesman of the Italian delegation, who said that it was a question for the United States to decide whether there should be a conference to deal with land armaments. Such a conference would be compelled, he explained, to take up the matter of European economic conditions in general.

It is the Italian view that the United States is in a better position to take the initiative in this matter. The European nations took the lead in their motives might be suspected, while all of the nations have the wholehearted belief that the Washington conference is sincere in its attempt to do what is right for the world.

FILIPINOS ASK TO BE CONSULTED IF INVOLVED
Resolution Requests It If Their Interests Come Up.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 1 (Associated Press).—Request that the American Armament Conference delegation take no action involving the Philippine Islands without calling into its council the Philippine Commissioners in Washington is contained in a joint resolution of the Legislature of the island of Luzon.

The resolution was sent to the War Department by Governor-General Wood, acting upon the request of the Legislature.

DENIES HE REPUDIATED ADMIRAL KATO'S RATIO
Tokugawa Issues Statement on Naval Issue.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 1 (Associated Press).—Denial was made to-night by Prince Tokugawa, one of Japan's armament delegates, that he repudiated or disapproved the recent assertion of Vice-Admiral Kanji Kato, chief naval adviser to the Japanese delegation, to the effect that Japan regarded a 70 per cent. ratio in capital ships tonnage as the basis for a satisfactory limitation.

Vice-Admiral Kato declared Japan must have a ratio of 70 per cent. instead of the 40 per cent. ratio provided in the American armament limitation proposals.

Prince Tokugawa a day or so after this declaration was made, was quoted as saying the Vice-Admiral's assertion was an expression of "personal opinion."

To-night Prince Tokugawa made the following statement:
"What I meant to convey the other evening in answering questions of newspaper correspondents concerning the interview given by Vice-Admiral Kanji Kato on the naval ratio question was that it was the opinion of the Japanese naval experts. I did not mean to contradict the views of Vice-Admiral Kato. Some people seemed to have interpreted what I said as being a repudiation or disapproval of the vice-admiral's opinion, but I did not convey any such idea."

CUBA ASKS \$14,189,541 FOR ARMY AND NAVY
HAVANA, Dec. 1.—Budget figures for the fiscal year 1922-1923, made public to-day, estimate revenues for the period at \$72,000,000 and expenditures at \$86,189,541. In a message presenting these figures to Congress President Zayas asks Congress to postpone consideration of the 1922-23 programs until the regular session to be opened the first Monday of next April, in order that he may have time to reorganize still further various Government departments.

In the provisional budget submitted for the appropriation for the War and Navy Department, \$14,189,541, leads all others, with \$9,529,717 for public instruction next on the list.

Lloyd George to Be Back in London by January 21

LONDON, Dec. 1 (Associated Press).—It is Premier Lloyd George's present intention to start for Washington about the middle of December, but he has given a definite promise to address the all England conference of the Liberal coalition party in London the third week in January. This confirms the expectation that his sojourn in Washington will be brief.

POWERS MAY CALL PARLEY ON ARMIES

Would Succeed Present Conference and Include More Nations.

SPECIAL DESPATCH TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.
New York Herald Bureau.
Washington, D. C., Dec. 1.

Another conference of nations is to be held to settle the questions of land armaments. Such a conference as now contemplated would include more nations than are at present participating in the Washington sessions. The reason is that some of the largest armies now in the field are maintained by nations not now a party to the conference.

The fact that such a conference is being considered by the delegates now in Washington developed to-night from British and Italian sources. It was learned soon afterward that similar sentiment exists among the other nations.

The present conference, under the call of President Harding, is for the limitation of armaments and for the settlement of Far Eastern questions, but the limitation of armaments, because of circumstances, is being confined to navies. The nations now sitting around the council table either are concerned primarily with naval or with Far Eastern questions, or both.

The report is current that a resolution will be presented to the present conference providing for the calling of a second conference soon to take up land armaments. Such a resolution, there is little doubt, would be adopted.

Such leading delegates to the present conference as Arthur J. Balfour of Great Britain, who is one of those who formulates the programme, are of the opinion that the fundamental question to be considered in connection with land armaments is the matter of conscription. Conscription is abolished in the various countries, with a common understanding, they believe a speedy solution may be reached by the adoption of a satisfactory limitation of the armaments.

Neither the United States nor Great Britain at this time has conscription. Their armies are limited, and in both instances the limitation is based on a view, are secondary to their navies. This is true, also, with Japan.

The French may possibly offer no immediate and open opposition to a conference on land armaments, but they will none the less be opposed to it on general grounds. It will be necessary for America and the other nations to accept the invitations and no doubt France will ask for certain conditions before accepting. She will say, for instance, that before Poland can be called upon to disarm it will be necessary to do something about Russia, and this brings up the question of de jure recognition of Russia. If Russia is not recognized the Powers may not invite her to the conference. If Russia is invited will the other Powers guarantee Poland against Russia and France against Germany? Unless the Powers calling the conference are prepared to give guarantees France may ask that a method of getting over this difficulty be the first thing to be considered.

The situation as it applies to Italy was outlined by the spokesman of the Italian delegation, who said that it was a question for the United States to decide whether there should be a conference to deal with land armaments. Such a conference would be compelled, he explained, to take up the matter of European economic conditions in general.

It is the Italian view that the United States is in a better position to take the initiative in this matter. The European nations took the lead in their motives might be suspected, while all of the nations have the wholehearted belief that the Washington conference is sincere in its attempt to do what is right for the world.

FILIPINOS ASK TO BE CONSULTED IF INVOLVED
Resolution Requests It If Their Interests Come Up.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 1 (Associated Press).—Request that the American Armament Conference delegation take no action involving the Philippine Islands without calling into its council the Philippine Commissioners in Washington is contained in a joint resolution of the Legislature of the island of Luzon.

The resolution was sent to the War Department by Governor-General Wood, acting upon the request of the Legislature.

DENIES HE REPUDIATED ADMIRAL KATO'S RATIO
Tokugawa Issues Statement on Naval Issue.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 1 (Associated Press).—Denial was made to-night by Prince Tokugawa, one of Japan's armament delegates, that he repudiated or disapproved the recent assertion of Vice-Admiral Kanji Kato, chief naval adviser to the Japanese delegation, to the effect that Japan regarded a 70 per cent. ratio in capital ships tonnage as the basis for a satisfactory limitation.

Vice-Admiral Kato declared Japan must have a ratio of 70 per cent. instead of the 40 per cent. ratio provided in the American armament limitation proposals.

Prince Tokugawa a day or so after this declaration was made, was quoted as saying the Vice-Admiral's assertion was an expression of "personal opinion."

To-night Prince Tokugawa made the following statement:
"What I meant to convey the other evening in answering questions of newspaper correspondents concerning the interview given by Vice-Admiral Kanji Kato on the naval ratio question was that it was the opinion of the Japanese naval experts. I did not mean to contradict the views of Vice-Admiral Kato. Some people seemed to have interpreted what I said as being a repudiation or disapproval of the vice-admiral's opinion, but I did not convey any such idea."

CUBA ASKS \$14,189,541 FOR ARMY AND NAVY
HAVANA, Dec. 1.—Budget figures for the fiscal year 1922-1923, made public to-day, estimate revenues for the period at \$72,000,000 and expenditures at \$86,189,541. In a message presenting these figures to Congress President Zayas asks Congress to postpone consideration of the 1922-23 programs until the regular session to be opened the first Monday of next April, in order that he may have time to reorganize still further various Government departments.

In the provisional budget submitted for the appropriation for the War and Navy Department, \$14,189,541, leads all others, with \$9,529,717 for public instruction next on the list.

AMERICA TO BLOCK JAPAN IN SHANTUNG

Tokio's Envoys Misjudge U. S. Position in Regards to Arms Cuts.

BARTER PLAN TO FAIL

Nippon Withholds Assent to Naval Ratio Though Approving It.

CHINA DEALS TO BE OPEN

Delegates Hold First Meeting on Dispute Involving Peninsula.

SPECIAL DESPATCH TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.
New York Herald Bureau.
Washington, D. C., Dec. 1.

The problem of Shantung, the direct issue between Japan and China, entered the armament conference to-day despite efforts to eliminate it from the agenda.

It is now clearly recognized that Shantung represents all of the issues in the Far Eastern question, which is involved directly in the matter of limitation of armaments, because the American delegation is determined that nothing shall be decided regarding armaments unless there is a satisfactory agreement in the Far East.

It was thought yesterday that the Japanese had scored in having compelled consideration of the Shantung question by the representatives of Japan and China. In a sense the Japanese were the victors, but it was apparent today that their victory was Pyrrhic.

Spokesmen for the American delegation made it plain that the results of the direct consideration of the Shantung question by the Japanese and Chinese would have to be reported to the conference. This makes it impossible for Japan to impose any condition on China which shall be concealed from the vision-judgment of the world.

It became clear also that Japan has failed to take into consideration American public opinion. The opinion is anxiously inclined toward the programme of Secretary Hughes for a limitation of armaments. It has been plain all along that Japan would accept the American naval reduction proposal and that seeming objection to it was based on the hope of being able to trade it in for better terms in the Far Eastern settlement.

Japan Misjudges America.
Up to the last few days American public opinion has been inclined to accept the Japanese proposals as indicative of their desire to live in with generally accepted world demands. Failure of the Japanese to accept the ratio of existing strength as the yardstick for the limitation of naval armaments has caused American public opinion to veer from this conclusion.

As the negotiations relative to Shantung have developed it has become plain that the Japanese delegation is aiming to ask greater concessions in the Far East if it yields to the American demand for the ratio of capital ships. This expectation of a bartering basis is predicted on assumption by the Japanese that the Harding Administration is committed to the programme for the limitation of armaments and that public opinion in this country would not justify failure of the arms programme on the ground that Far Eastern settlements are not satisfactory.

Information from the American delegation shows that nothing could be further from the truth. The American delegation earnestly and sincerely desires the limitation of armaments. But it knows that it would be futile to leave the germ of future wars in the Far East. The American delegation is prepared to accept the alternative of competitive building, and it is well known here that Japan cannot meet that competition.

Baron Kato, head of the Japanese delegation, admitted to-night there was no deadlock in the negotiations concerning naval ratio. This adds to the belief that Japan is blocking an agreement in the hope of getting concessions in the Far East.

Japan is expressing friendly feelings toward China. Failure to put these expressions into action prompt the suggestion that Japan is aiming to maintain her position of aggrandizement in Manchuria and eastern Inner Mongolia. While these issues are being discussed Japan is endeavoring to secure naval ratio with the evident intention of yielding eventually, provided the proper degree of concessions are exacted in the Far East.

The Day's Communique.
The Chinese delegates are determined there shall be no concessions on Shantung. They will insist on the reversion of Shantung to China without conditions and they have not given up their determination that all of the secret agreements relative to China shall be placed before the conference so the world can review them.

Mr. Hughes for the American delegation and Arthur J. Balfour for the British started the Shantung conference between the Japanese and Chinese representatives to-day. After the parties to the negotiations had been introduced, Secretary Hughes and Mr. Balfour withdrew, leaving the British and American envoys at work.

What the conference started to discuss was contained in the communique, which was chiefly valuable because of the conclusions in it. The communique follows:
"The conversations between the Chinese and Japanese delegates relative to the Shantung question were arranged through the good offices of Mr. Hughes and Mr. Balfour commenced this afternoon at 3 o'clock in the conference room of the Pan-American Building."

"The meeting on the part of China was accompanied by Mr. Saburi, Mr. Kikuchi, Mr. Sato and Mr. Shiratori. Mr. Hughes and Mr. Balfour accompanied by Sir John Jordan, Mr. Miles Lamson, Mr. J. V. A. MacMurray and Mr. Edward Bell, opened the meeting and retired, leaving the above named American and British representatives to assist at the sessions."

"The meeting discussed questions of procedure and decided to issue a communique at the end of each meeting. The next meeting will be held in the same building at 3:30 P. M. Friday afternoon next."

CHINESE FEAR TRAP IN SHANTUNG PARLEY

Jabin Hsu Says His People Want Issue With Japan Settled in the Open.

NOTHING TO NEGOTIATE

Ghost of Versailles Seen Haunting Washington to Help Nipponese.

RECALLS WILSON'S FATE

China's Ten Points and Root's Four Resolutions Being Weighed in Balance.

By JABIN HSU.
Special Correspondent China Press, Shanghai.
Special Despatch to THE NEW YORK HERALD.
New York Herald Bureau.
Washington, D. C., Dec. 1.

The ghost of Versailles is haunting Washington. The Chinese delegation has been lured or scared into a "conversation" with Japan on the Shantung issue, which ruined Wilson and his famous fourteen points, prompted a nationwide anti-Japanese demonstration in China and led China to reject the Versailles conference peace treaty.

The delegates representing China have accepted the "good offices" offered by Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour "in the suggestion that there should be conversations between representatives of China and Japan looking to the settlement of the questions relating to Shantung and the leased territory of Kiauchow."

To this, Chinese at home and abroad give but one interpretation. It is a direct deal. The conference has been suggested that it should be settled outside. The delegates to the conference, Mr. Hughes and Lord Balfour, as well as the Chinese in particular, are once more resorting to "back door" diplomacy.

The Chinese people are convinced that this sort of "conversation" can make little change in the situation. Bitter experiences have taught them so. When Japan says "Let us negotiate," she means "Let us bargain."

On Shantung China does not want to bargain. Her position is: "I demand that Japan fulfill her pledge made in 1914 before she seized Kiauchow. We can see no reason in her request for negotiation. We never recognized that she had any rights in Teing-tao at all. Why should we negotiate with her?"

Opposed to Negotiation.
The Chinese people, or the politically conscious section of the Chinese, are convinced that China can get nothing out of direct negotiation. They are unequivocally opposed to such negotiations, the very suggestion of which is so unsavory to Chinese appetites. Their opposition, although somewhat unreasonable from the diplomatic standpoint, is inspired by two considerations. First is the fear that such negotiations may be so construed as to mean a recognition of the Versailles treaty, which China never signed. Second is the mistrust that their own delegation may be bluffed or forced into some bargain which would constitute a further loss of sovereignty than now existing.

Shantung is not a Chinese issue. It is a world issue. Public opinion not only in China but all over the world demands that a just settlement be reached in the conference. The Chinese do not see how this is possible, even taking into consideration the manifestly important role which Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour will play in the "conversations."

One thing is certain. Britain, France and Italy are still clinging to the Versailles treaty and are from supporting Japan's claims, while American sentimentality fails to point out any violation in the letter of Japan's pledge to return the leased territory and is ready to yield in exchange for Japan's acceptance of the "5-5-3" naval ratio.

Chinese have realized at the early stage of the conference that Japan was holding up the naval ratio issue to bargain for Far Eastern gains. The present move has confirmed that belief. Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour may be a diplomatic finesse. The Chinese acceptance may also be a matter of strategy.

The Chinese people would be accused of being unreasonable were they insensible of the spirit of achievement which Secretary Hughes and the Chinese delegates doubtless have entered into in consenting to this arrangement, but they see a decided lack of strategy.

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

China's ten points enunciated by her spokesmen have been accepted in principle by the conference, which in turn had adopted Mr. Root's four resolutions. Under these China is justified in bringing up the Shantung controversy before the conference itself. Why should Secretary Hughes and Lord Balfour suggest such a "conversation"? Doesn't their action amount to a recognition of their acceptance in principle of China's ten points? Doesn't their action suggest a repudiation of the four resolutions they themselves passed?

BARKING DOG
SHOWING MIXTURE
NEVER BITES
ALL DEALERS
FOR 35 YEARS THE
BEST QUALITY OBTAINABLE
There Is No Substitute

LONG ISLAND DUCK
ling is a pleasing change from the usual menu. The flavor of young duckling is delicious and satisfying. Your own butcher can supply you.

JEWELERS OF WORTH SINCE 1850
EFFECTIVE THRU DECEMBER
25% REDUCTION
on our choice stock of
Precious Stones, Jewelry, Silverware
from tag-prices already reduced to present replacement costs
This Sale affords an exceptional opportunity to purchase Christmas Gifts at remarkably low prices. All goods are marked in plain figures.
T. KIRKPATRICK & CO.
624 FIFTH AVENUE, at Fifth Street
NEW YORK

Saks & Company Have Arranged for Today
A SALE of
Men's Soft Hats
in a variety of new and very smart models, every hat beautifully silk lined
At 3.45

Hats with the new medium, easy rolling brim and decidedly rakish styles that will appeal especially to younger men. Only the very best materials have been used to develop the various models, and every hat in the collection reflects in its careful workmanship the skill of the most expert. All colors from new browns to conservative grays.

Men's Cloth Hats
Reduced to 1.85
Formerly 3.00. The best knockabout hats made. Dozens of patterns to choose from, in both light and dark colors.
Fifth Floor

Men's Dress Oxfords
7.75
Very smart oxfords, made over a graceful last in Patent Calfskin. Unequaled anywhere at 7.75.
Fifth Floor
Saks & Company
BROADWAY at 34th STREET

Private Stocks
"at twice as long and taste much better when blended with this delectable drink."
For cocktails—superb!
"Original Recipes" that tell how to make them—free upon request.
Dermonth Monquing
Restaurant & Wine Co.
404 West 42nd St., N. Y. Tel. Spring 5845.